

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 7, 2006.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19 and 20 have been rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,062,807 to Guss, III (“Guss”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,293 to Fuchs et al. (“Fuchs”). Applicants traverse these rejections.

The combination of Guss and Fuchs does not disclose or suggest at least a connecting structure for auxiliary machinery and a flat cable in which conductors arrayed in a flat configuration are integrally surrounded by an insulating covering, as recited in independent claim 1. The Examiner admits that Guss fails to disclose or suggest at least the configuration of the cable. Fuchs does not cure the deficiencies of Guss.

Figures 1-3, 5 and 6 of Fuchs clearly show that the multi-conductor cable 15 is not a flat cable as in Applicants’ claim 1, but is rather a round cable. As shown in Fig. 4 of Fuchs, after the wires 14 have been stripped out of the multi-conductor cable 15, the individual wires 14 of the multi-conductor cable 15 are arranged for attachment to the contacts 16. Therefore, Fuchs discloses ***a plurality of tubular wires*** arranged in a row, ***not a cable*** in which conductors arrayed in a flat configuration are integrally surrounded by an insulating covering, as recited in independent claim 1.

Further, the combined references do not disclose or suggest wherein a surface of a first portion of said cable extends along an outer side of said auxiliary machinery, as recited in claim 1. With regard to Guss, the Examiner alleges that the connector housing 10 is the auxiliary

machinery as claimed by Applicants. As illustrated in the figures of Guss, the cable extends away from the alleged auxiliary machinery without extending along an outer side of the auxiliary machinery, as recited in the claim. The figures of Fuchs disclose a similar configuration to that of Guss.

With regard to independent claim 3, the combination of Guss and Fuchs fails to disclose or suggest at least a waterproofing structure for an auxiliary machinery that is directly connected to a flat cable in which conductors arrayed in a flat configuration are integrally surrounded by an insulating covering, and a molded part for sealing a connection between said connection terminal of said housing and said at least one conductor of said cable. As established above, the combined references do not to disclose or suggest a flat cable in which conductors arrayed in a flat configuration are integrally surrounded by an insulating covering. Since the combined references fail to disclose or suggest such a flat cable configuration, they also fail to teach a molded part for sealing a connection between said connection terminal of said housing and said flat cable, as in the claim.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1 and 3 are patentable over the combination of Guss and Fuchs. Claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19 and 20, which depend from one of claims 1 and 3, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 2 has been rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guss and Fuchs, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,620,333 to Boyle ("Boyle").

The combination of Guss, Fuchs and Boyle does not disclose or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 2. Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporates the features of claim 1. As established above, the combination of Guss and Fuchs does not disclose

or suggest at least a flat cable in which conductors arrayed in a flat configuration are integrally surrounded by an insulating covering, as recited in independent claim 1. Boyle does not cure the deficiencies of the combination. Applicants traverse this rejection.

As illustrated in Fig. 1, Boyle discloses a tubular multi-conductor cable which terminates in a connector assembly 14 after passing through a strain relief hood 18. Further, this structure does not provide for reducing the space required for connecting the cable and connector assembly. Since Boyle clearly discloses a round multi-conductor cable, as opposed to Applicants' claimed cable having a flat configuration, even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention have been motivated to combine the references, the combination still would not result in the claimed features. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over the combination of Guss, Fuchs and Boyle.

Claim 4 has been rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guss and Fuchs, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,238,426 to Arnett ("Arnett"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The combined references do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 4. As established above, the combination of Guss and Fuchs does not disclose or suggest at least a flat cable in which conductors arrayed in a flat configuration are integrally surrounded by an insulating covering, as recited in independent claim 4. The Examiner relies on Arnett to disclose features of a receiving member and a retainer which do not cure the above deficiencies of the combination. Since the combined references fail to disclose or suggest at least the above features, claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Guss, Fuchs and Arnett.

Dependent claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 21 have been rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guss, Fuchs and Arnett, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,125,852 to Archer ("Archer"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

The combination of Guss, Fuchs, Arnett and Archer does not disclose the features claimed by Applicants. The Examiner relies on Archer to allegedly disclose the mounting and retaining features claimed in the dependent claims. Archer, however, does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of the Guss, Fuchs and Arnett combination. The Examiner also relies on Archer to allegedly disclose additional features of a receiving member and a retainer which also do not cure the above deficiencies of the combination. Since the combination of Guss, Fuchs, Arnett and Archer fails to disclose or suggest the features of claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 21, these claims are patentable over the combined references.

### **Conclusion**


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 114(c)  
U.S. SERIAL NO.: 10/670,524

Atty. Docket No.: Q77632

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Howard L. Bernstein  
Registration No. 25,665

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 14, 2006